

**STUDENTS' ABILITY IN SUMMARIZING READING TEXT AT THE  
SECOND YEAR OF SMA MUHAMMADIYAH RAMBAH**

A Thesis

Submitted to fulfill one of Requirements for

Bachelor Degree in English Education

(S.Pd.)



By

**MISRAWATI NASUTION**

**NIM. 10614003474**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1431 H /2010 M**

**STUDENTS' ABILITY IN SUMMARIZING READING TEXT AT THE  
SECOND YEAR OF SMA MUHAMMADIYAH RAMBAH**



**By**

**MISRAWATI NASUTION**

**NIM. 10614003474**

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1431 H /2010 M**





## ABSTRACT

### **Misrawati Nasution(2010): Students' Ability in Summarizing Reading Text at the Second Year of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah**

The purpose of this research was to know the ability of second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing reading text. We know that English has been taught since Elementary School, three years in Junior High School. Those, the second year students of Senior High School have studied English starting from the first year. Summarizing text is one of the teaching reading techniques used by English teacher in SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah, and Reading material is always taught well by the teacher. But, when the teacher asks the students to summarize reading text, many students make incorrect summary. Thus, the writer is interested to do a research dealing with this matter to know the students' ability in summarizing reading text. The writer formulates the problems of this research into how is the students' ability of second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing reading text?

The subject of this research was the second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah and the object of this research was ability of summarizing reading text of second year students. The population was the second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah. There were 113 students in three classes; they were 35 students in IPA class, 40 students in IPS 1, and 38 students IPS 2. The writer took 20% of them. The instruments of this study were test. In analyzing the data, the writer used Scoring Guide of ESL Composition Profile. Then, to find the level of students' ability in summarizing reading text, the writer used formula as follows:

$$M = \frac{\sum Fx}{N}$$

Notes:

M = Mean

N = Total number of the students' score

$\sum Fx$  = Total number of score

The last, to classify their level in summarizing, the writer used category of scoring that also we also can see in technique of analyzing data.

Based on the data analysis, it can be concluded that the result of the students' ability in summarizing reading text is categorized in to enough. The average score of students' score in summarizing is 65.68 which is located at the category 60-69%.

## ABSTRAK

### **Misrawati Nasution(2010): Kemampuan Siswa Kelas 2 SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah dalam Meringkas isi Bacaan**

Tujuan penelitian adalah untuk mengetahui kemampuan siswa kelas 2 SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah dalam meringkas bacaan. Kelas 2 SMA telah belajar bahasa inggris sejak SD, selanjutnya belajar selama 3 tahun di SMP, dan tentunya sudah belajar selama satu tahun di SMA, otomatis dalam belajar bahasa inggris, guru bahasa inggris mengajarkan skill membaca. Dan guru bahasa inggris di SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah menggunakan ringkasan bacaan sebagai salah satu tehnik dalam mengajar skill membaca. Guru bahasa inggris selalu mengajarkan skill membaca dengan baik dan sering menyuruh siswa meringkas isi bacaan ketika belajar skill membaca akan tetapi banyak dari mereka sering membuat ringkasan yang salah. Penulis melakukan penelitian di sekolah ini untuk mengetahui bagaimanakah kemampuan sebenarnya dari siswa kelas 2 SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah dalam meringkas bacaan. Penulis merumuskan masalah sebagai berikut : Bagaimanakah kemampuan siswa kelas 2 SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah dalam meringkas bacaan?

Subjek penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas 2 SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah. Objek penelitian ini adalah kemampuan siswa dalam meringkas isi bacaan. Populasi penelitian ini adalah seluruh siswa kelas 2 yang berjumlah 113 orang, terdiri dari 35 orang siswa IPA, 40 orang IPS 1, dan 35 orang IPS 2. Penulis hanya mengambil sample 20% dari populasi, yang diambil secara proporsional. Teknik pengumpulan data adalah menggunakan test. Dalam menganalisa data penulis menggunakan rumus guru bahasa inggris dalam penilaian writing, yang bisa dilihat pada tehnik analisa data, dan untuk mengetahui kemampuan siswa dalam meringkas isi bacaan penulis menggunakan rumus mencari nilai rata-rata sebagai berikut:

$$M = \frac{\sum Fx}{N}$$

Notes:

M = Nilai rata-rata

N = Jumlah siswa

$\sum Fx$  = Total dari nilai siswa

Dan terakhir, untuk mengetahui tingkat kemampuan siswa dalam meringkas isi bacaan, penulis menggunakan kategori penilaian yang juga bisa dilihat pada teknik analisa data.

Berdasarkan hasil analisa data, penulis menyimpulkan bahwa kemampuan siswa kelas 2 SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah dalam meringkas isi bacaan adalah dikategorikan kepada level cukup, yang nilai rata-rata siswa adalah 65,68 yang ditempatkan pada kategori 61-69%.

## الملخص

ميسراواتي (2010): قدرة تلاميذ الفصل الثاني من المدرسة الوسطى العليا محمديّة رامباه في تلخيص القراءة.

غرض هذا البحث لمعرفة قدرة تلاميذ الفصل الثاني من المدرسة الوسطى العليا محمديّة رامباه في تلخيص القراءة. كان الفصل الثاني من المدرسة الوسطى العليا محمديّة رامباه تعلموا اللغة الانجليزية ثلاث سنوات في المدرسة الوسطى الأولى، بالطبع قد تعلموا سنة واحدة في المدرسة الوسطى العليا، في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية يتعلمون القراءة ألياً. ومعلم اللغة الإنجليزية استعمل تلخيص القراءة من إحدى التقنيات في تعليم القراءة. كان معلم اللغة الإنجليزية يعلمون اللغة الإنجليزية حسناً ويدوم على أمر التلاميذ بتلخيص القراءة لذلك نعتقد أن لتلاميذ الفصل الثاني من المدرسة الوسطى العليا محمديّة را قدرة حسنة في تلخيص القراءة ولكن أكثرهم أخطأوا في التلخيص أو كان تلخيصهم لايناسب لب القراءة الأصلية. مهماكان معلم اللغة الإنجليزية قال ذلك، ولم نعرف قدرة تلاميذ الفصل الثاني من المدرسة الوسطى العليا محمديّة رامباه في التلخيص في الحقيقة، لمعرفة حالة قدرتهم الحقيقية، عقد الباحث هذا البحث في هذه المدرسة. قدم الباحث رموز المسألة كما الآتي: كيف كانت قدرة تلاميذ الفصل الثاني من المدرسة الوسطى العليا محمديّة رامباه في تلخيص القراءة؟ وما العوامل التي تؤثر قدرة تلاميذ الفصل الثاني من المدرسة الوسطى العليا محمديّة رامباه في تلخيص القراءة؟

موضوع هذا البحث تلاميذ الفصل الثاني من المدرسة الوسطى العليا محمديّة رامباه. هدف هذا البحث قدرة التلاميذ في تلخيص القراءة. السكان في هذا البحث جميع تلاميذ الفصل الثاني بعدد 113 نفر، يتكونون من 35 نفراً من العلم الكوني، 40 نفراً من العلم الاجتماعي 1، 35 من العلم الاجتماعي 2. أخذ الباحث 20 في المائة من السكان حيث يؤخذ لغزياً. تقنية جمع البيانات باستخدام الاختبار والاستفتاء. في تحليل البيانات استعمل الباحث رموز معلم اللغة الإنجليزية تمكن نظريته في تقنية البيانات، ولمعرفة قدرة التلاميذ في تلخيص القراءة، استعمل الباحث رموز البحث عن معدل النتيجة حيث كما الآتي:

$$M = \sum \frac{Fx}{N}$$

الملاحظ: M = النتيجة المعدلة

N = عدد التلاميذ

$$\sum Fx = \text{المجموعة من نتيجة التلاميذ}$$

وأخيراً، لمعرفة مستوى قدرة التلاميذ في تلخيص القراءة استعمل الباحث صنف الإنتاج حيث كذلك تمكن نظريته من تقنية تحليل البيانات.

مستند إلى حاصل تحليل البيانات، استنتب الباحث أن قدرة التلاميذ من المدرسة الوسطى العليا محمديّة رامباه في تلخيص القراءة صنف جيد، حيث نتيجة معدل التلاميذ 65,63 ما وقع في الفئة 71-79 في المائة.

## LIST OF CONTENT

Pages

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

### TABLE OF CONTENT

### THE LIST OF TABLE

### CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Problem .....	1
B. The Problems .....	4
1. The Identification of the Problem .....	4
2. The Limitation of the Problem.....	5
3. The Formulation of the Problem.....	5
C. The Reason of Choosing Title .....	5
D. The Objective and the Significance of the Research .....	6
1. The objective of study.....	6
2. The significance of the study.....	6
E. The Definition of terms.....	7

### CHAPTER II REVIEWING THE RELATED LITERATURE

A. Theoretical Framework.....	9
1. The Nature of reading .....	9
2. The Nature of summarizing .....	11
a. summarizing.....	11
b. Differences between summarizing and paraphrasing.....	12
c. Differences between summary and analysis .....	12
3. The Nature of ability in summarizing reading text .....	13
B. The Relevant of Research.....	16
C. The Operational Concept.....	17

### CHAPTER III THE RESEARCH OF METHODOLOGY

A. The research design .....	18
B. Location and time of the research .....	18
C. Subject and object of the research .....	18
D. The population and sample.....	18
E. The technique of collecting data .....	19
F. The technique of analyzing data .....	19

### CHAPTER IV THE DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

A. The Data Presentation .....	22
B. The Data Analysis.....	39



CHAPTER V THE CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	
A. The Conclusion .....	42
B. The Suggestion.....	42

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDIXES

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **A. Background**

There are four language skills in English. They are: listening, speaking, reading and writing. We know that listening and reading are receptive skills while speaking and writing are productive skills. But, there is a connection between writing and reading because of connection between writers and readers. When a writer makes writing, he will discover and construct meaning and interpreting information in order the reader to be able interpret his intentions, and the reader will reconstruct and rediscover that meaning by his knowledge in order that he can interpret the writer's intentions. In similar ways Horowitz, Smith, and Spivey (in Reid, 1993:15) said that the writer actively discovers and constructs meaning, interpreting, and re-interpreting information for a reader, and the reader reconstructs and rediscovers that meaning by actively bring his world knowledge and experience to the text.

Based on the quotation above, we have known that it has relationship between reading and writing. For example, when we make a summary from reading text, of course, we have to read the text in advance.

Written summary is one piece of writing. Like other writings, in summary we also need to organize it by correcting grammar in order that our summary is easy to be understood. So, if a text provides a summary, we can know the content of the text generally without reading the text. McWhorter (1992: 26) says that in

some textbooks, the last few paragraphs may be labeled “summary”. By reading the summary before reading the chapter, you will learn the general focus and content of the text.

Summarizing reading text also can be used as one technique of teaching reading strategies because this technique has developed by experts before. Palinscar and Brown (2009: May 04<sup>th</sup>) developed a technique called reciprocal teaching that taught students to predict, summarize, clarify, and ask questions for sections of text. Since then, the use of these strategies like summarizing after reading each paragraph have come to be seen as effective strategies for building students’ comprehension.

SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah is an old school in Rokan hulu. It has been built since 1991. The school is stated in Pasir Pangarayan, the capital of Rokan Hulu regency. Based on the curriculum of that school, English is taught as one of the main subjects and it is examined in national examination or UN. English is taught four hours a week. Reading material is always taught well by the teacher, and the teacher often gives reading text to the students and asks them to summarize it.

Summarizing text is one of the teaching reading techniques used by English teacher in SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah. By summarizing text, the students will read the text repeatedly. It can increase their ability in spelling and also in understanding and comprehending the content of the text. Then, by summarizing the text, the students will be able make condensation of the text based on the main ideas of the text, and also they will try to find the main ideas of the text directly. Then, summarizing text can also increase the students’ knowledge in vocabularies. For

example, they will find new vocabularies, ambiguity meaning and synonym and they will check it in their dictionary.

We know that English has been taught since Elementary School, three years in Junior High School, and three years in Senior High School. Therefore, the second year students should have good ability in summarizing reading text, but in reality they still get difficulties in summarizing. When the teacher asks the students to summarize reading text, many students make incorrect summary, their summary is not suitable with the content of the text. Even though the teacher said like that, we do not know the real condition of ability of second years' students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing reading text. So, to know their ability accurately the writer does research there.

The students may do not understand about the text because they do not know the meaning of the words in the reading text, and this may also happen because they could not guess the meaning of the difficult words based on the context of the reading text, and they also have limited vocabularies. Besides, their background knowledge about the reading text may also influence them in summarizing.

The writer found the symptoms as follows:

1. Some students get difficulty in guessing the meaning of the words.
2. The teacher always teaches reading well, but the students still get difficulties in summarizing the reading text.
3. The teacher always asks the students check vocabularies in dictionary, but they still have limited vocabulary.

4. Some students understand the content of the text, but they get problems in guessing the main ideas of the text, so it makes them get difficulties in summarizing the reading text.

Pertaining to the symptoms above, the writer is interested to investigate these problems entitled “STUDENTS’ ABILITY IN SUMMARIZING READING TEXT AT THE SECOND YEAR OF SMA MUHAMMADIYAH RAMBAH.

## **B. Problems**

### **1. The Identification of the Problem**

Based on the background above, we know that the second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah still get problems in summarizing reading text. The problems may come from the students and also come from the reading subject itself. Therefore, to know the problems clearly, the writer identifies the problems as follows:

1. Why do some students get difficulties in summarizing reading text?
2. The teacher always teaches reading well. How good are the students in summarizing reading text?
3. If the teacher always asks the students to memorize vocabularies, why do the students still have limited vocabulary?
4. Some students understand the text. What factors making students get problems in guessing the main ideas of the text?
5. Do the students get difficulties in guessing the main idea of reading text?

## **2. The Limitation of the Problem**

Because of the limitation of writer's ability and the scope is too large, therefore the writer needs to limit the problem. The writer only discuss about **Students' Ability in Summarizing Reading text at the Second year of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah.**

## **3. The formulation of the Problem**

Based on the problems above, the problem of this research was formulated in to "How is the students' ability of second year SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing reading text?"

## **C. The Reason of choosing the Title**

The writer is interested in carrying out the problems above because of several reasons:

1. This research is interested for the writer because summarizing of reading text can improve the students' ability in comprehension, especially for Reading.
2. This research has a relationship to the writer' status as an English education department Student.
3. As far the writer is concerned, this title has never researched yet by other researcher.

## **D. The Objective and Significance of Study**

### **1. The Objective of the Research**

The objective of this research is to know the students' ability of second year SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing reading text

### **2. The Significances of the Research**

This research is very important because it will show the students' level toward the ability in summarizing reading text at the second year of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing, and the writer hopes that it can distribute as useful information for:

1. Giving some inputs for the teacher generally, especially for English teacher in SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah and the writer hopes this researcher finding provides the both theoretical and practical benefits for English teacher who wants to teach reading.
2. Providing the information of students' ability in summarizing the reading text, and gives contribution to the students for improving their ability in comprehending the reading text.
3. Fulfilling the requirements to finish the writer's undergraduate study program at English Education Department of Education and Teacher Training faculty of State Islamic University Sultan Syarif Kasim of Riau.

## **E. The Definition of the Term**

To simplify the process of designing and application of the research and to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation, it is necessary to define the operational definition terms comprised in this research:

### **1. Ability**

According to Hornby, Parnwell, and Siswojo (1984: 1) Ability is ability to do something. Ability may be: aptitude, ability to pay, intelligence, physical ability, skill, and expertise (Wikipedia, 2009: May 04<sup>th</sup>). However, the Ability in this research refers to the ability in summarizing the reading text.

### **2. Summary**

According to Syafii, (2007: 60) A summary is a statement of the main idea of a longer portion of a work. A summary does not need to capture the details of the paragraph of work that you are summarizing. In edition, (1988:110) defines that A summary is a condensation of the main ideas in an article.

### **3. Reading**

Longman, (1999: 378) defined that Reading is a perceiving written text in order to understand its contents. The understanding that results is called reading comprehension. Wikipedia, (2009: May 4<sup>th</sup>) also defined that Reading is a complex cognitive process of decoding symbols for the intention of deriving meaning (reading comprehension) and/or constructing meaning. Reading is a



means of language acquisition, of communication, and of sharing information and ideas.

#### 4. Text

Longman (1999: 378) defined text is a piece of spoken or written language. A text may be considered from the point of view of its structure and its function, e.g. warning, instruction, and carrying out a transaction. A text may consist of just one word, e.g. a sermon or a novel.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEWING THE RELATED LITERATURE**

#### **A. The Theoretical Framework**

##### **1. The Nature of Reading**

In reading a text, we read the text word by word, sentence by sentence, and paragraph by paragraph to get the meaning of the text. McWhorter (1992:23) stated that Reading is a routine activity in which individual words are combined to produce meaning.

If someone asked about reasons and purposes of people reading a text, he will give various answers because they may have different reasons and purposes when reading one text. Nuttall (1983: 3) said that you read because you wanted to get something from the writing: facts, ideas, enjoyment, even feelings of family community (from a letter): whatever it was, the reader wanted to get the message that writer had expressed.

Based on the quotation above, the writer concludes that a reader read a text to get the message from the text, so, a reader has to read the text effectively. McWhorter (1992:23) revealed that effective reading is not a single- step process, but a complex set of skills involving activities before, during, and after reading. Here the activities that has to do by a reader:

Before reading:

1. Determining the subject of the material
2. Determining how material is organized
3. Deciding what is need to remember from the material
4. Defining the purpose for reading

During reading:

1. Identifying what is important
2. Determining how key ideas are supported
3. Identifying patterns of thought
4. Drawing connections a among ideas
5. Anticipating what is to come next
6. Relating ideas to what the reader already know

During and after reading:

1. Identifying the author's purpose for writing
2. Analyzing the writer's technique and language
3. Evaluating the writer's competence or authority
4. Asking critical questions
5. Evaluating the nature and type of supporting evidence.

According to Kalayo and Ansyari (2007:114), Reading is an interactive process that goes on between the reader and text, resulting in comprehension. When we read, we need comprehension. Without comprehension, we will get nothing from our reading activity because the purpose of reading the text is getting

comprehension. Comprehension is whether the students have understood what they have read.

Clark and Clark (1977:44) said that comprehension is the readers put the interpretations and they normally extract the new information it conveys and store that information in memory. That is the definitions of comprehension. So, after getting comprehension, we will be easy to make summary both in written and oral form.

## **2. The Nature of Summarizing**

### **a. Summarizing**

In summarizing, we may just make a sentence of summary from a paragraph of reading text and also make one or two paragraphs from a charter of reading text. Because in summarizing we just retell the important point of the text, not retell all information detail. According to McWhoter (1986:126), a summary provides a review of important ideas. It can be thought of as an outline in a paragraph form. The order in which the information appears in the summary reflects the organization of the article itself. The length of a summary depends on the content of the text.

McWhoter (in Syafii, 2007:60) defined that “summary” as a compact restatement of the key points of a passage. McWhoter (in Syafii, 2007:60) also said that a summary does not include all information presented in the original text; instead, you have to select what to include. A summary contains only the core points of the original text, with limited background, explanation, or detail. Although all

summaries are in a very length, they are often one-quarter or less of the length of the original source text.

#### **b. Differences between Summarizing and Paraphrasing**

Like paraphrasing, in summarizing we are put an author's idea in our own words. But exactly summarizing and paraphrasing has differences. Normally, in paraphrasing we put an author's idea from a sentences or a paragraph than in summarizing we put an author's idea from a longer paragraph, a section of an article, or a chapter of 1 book (Syafii, 2007:49).

Based on the explanation above, we can conclude that summarizing is different from paraphrasing because usually we can only paraphrase a sentence or a short paragraph, but we summarize a longer paragraph, a chapter of book, or one book.

#### **c. Differences between Summary and Analysis**

Summary is not analysis. In summary, we just make a condensation of the main ideas in an article. Than, in analysis we make a summary that contains our opinion, comment, and suggestion. If we want to make an analysis we have to make summary before.

Reid (1988:110) defined that a summary is a condensation of the main ideas in an article. The length of a summary depends on the assignment, length of the article, and audience.

Based on the quotation above, we can say that summary is different from analysis. In summary, we only include the author's idea but in analysis include our opinion and suggestion about the article.

### **3. The Nature of Ability in Summarizing Reading Text**

If we talk about ability, we will talk about our skill or capability to do something. Ability means our capability to do something, including our intelligence, skill, or expertise (wikipedia, 2009: june 04<sup>th</sup>). But, here the meaning of ability is students' ability in summarizing the reading text.

Someone who is able summarize reading text is someone who is able make condensation of the main ideas of the reading text, the content of a summary is the condensation of main ideas of the reading text. Reid (1988:110) said that a summary is a condensation of the main ideas in an article. We can find the intentions of the author in the main ideas of reading text, in other word; we will find what the author says about the topic in main ideas of the text. Dealing with the writer's idea McWhorter (1986:76) said that the main idea is what the author wants you to know about the topic, and also what the author saying about the topic.

Vocabulary mastery also influences the students' ability in summarizing reading text because students will read the text before summarizing. They make summary based on their comprehension about the text. If the students know the meaning of vocabulary correctly, they will be able to make the correct summary. Shortly, the students will be able to make a good summary if they have more knowledge about vocabulary or master in vocabulary of reading text.

Reid (1988:110-111) presented about the process of summarizing material:

1. Read the article quickly, looking for the main ideas
2. Read it again carefully, absorbing the information

3. Look for the thesis and topic sentences : They will give you the main ideas of the article that you will need for your summary
4. Depending on the assignment, select the major ideas you will need to use in your summary
5. Arrange these ideas carefully in order to achieve balance and completeness
6. Begin the summary with a sentence that informs your reader of the title and author of the article. Example :

*Assignment exposition*, a book by Louise e. Rorabacher,  
discuss.....

If we want to make a good summary, of course, many things that has to be considered by us. Reid (1988:110) gave us several questions to judge a valid summary, they are:

1. Did you include all the important ideas?
2. Did you omit unnecessary words and phrases?
3. Does the summary read smoothly?
  - A. use transitions : also, thus, therefore, however
  - B. use of sentence combining
4. Would a reader of summary who had not read the article have a clear idea about the article?

Based on the more explanations before, the writer can conclude that the way to make summary are reading the text first, check dictionary to know the meaning of difficult words, absorb information from the text, find main ideas of the text, and the last, condense and write down main ideas by your own words.

Here example of summary according to Syafii, (2007:62)

(The original material)

*Convenience is the main advantage of shopping over internet. If you shop at mall, you have to shop during mall's hour's business. To do that, you have to do dressed, drive your car, use your gas, and find a parking space. With ecommerce, if you feel like shopping at midnight in pajamas and fuzzy bunny slippers, you can go right a head. Get a cup of hot chocolate, sit at your computer, and shop at your convenience, not someone else's.*

(The summary)

- a. Convenience is the main advantage of shopping over internet. While wearing fuzzy slipper, a persons can sit at the computer with a cup of cocoa and shop at his or her convenience.*
- b. Internet shopping at home is more convenient than mall shopping because one can shop at home without worrying about getting dressed, driving to a mall, or making it to a store before closing time.*



## **B. The Relevant Research**

As writer has concerned before, there are a lot of previous researches regarding with the analysis in summarizing the reading text. Like the writer said before that the purpose of summarizing the reading text is improving the students' abilities in reading comprehension. One of the analyses was conducted by Vivi Kamalasari, (2005) in her research; she focused on the effect toward students' achievement on reading comprehension through small group work in English teaching learning process. In her research, she found out the increasing ability of students in reading comprehension after she made experiment research and tried it. The writer can increase the students' ability by several techniques she used. It means that as a teacher, the writer can improve the students' ability in comprehension through small group by using several techniques of teaching reading.

The similar research was also conducted by Eko Andayani (2007). In her descriptive research, she focused on students' ability in reading visual information; Graphs, Charts, Tables, Maps, and Diagrams. She found out the difficulties of the second year students of English Education Department in reading visual information and she also conclude that the result of the students' ability in reading comprehension visual information is fail, and type of visual information that is difficult to understand by students is diagram. It means that the second year students of English Education Department get difficulties in reading visual information.

### **C. The Operational Concept**

Concept is a main element to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpreting in a scientific research. As a concept, it is still operated in abstract from the research plan which is to be interpreted in to particular words in order to be easy measured.

Based on the statement above, the indicators of the students' ability in summarizing reading text are as follows:

1. The students are able to find the meaning of difficult words of the reading text.
2. The content of students' summary is appropriate with the original text.
3. The students are able to find main ideas of the reading text.
4. The students summarize reading text by condensing main ideas of the reading text.
5. The students summarize the reading text by their own word.
6. The long of students' summary is one-quarter or less of the length of the original source text.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **A. The Research Design**

This study is descriptive quantitative research. It is only one variable, which describes students' ability in summarizing reading text at the second year of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah. Airasian (2000: 275) revealed that a descriptive method is useful for investigating a variety of educational problems and issues. It means that the problems are actual issues in education.

#### **B. The Location and Time of the Research**

This research was conducted at SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah. The time of research was around two months starting from March 2010.

#### **C. The Subject and Object of the Research**

The subject of this research was the second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah, while the object of this research was ability of summarizing reading text of second year students.

#### **D. The Population and Sample of the Research**

The population was the second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah. There were 113 students in three classes; they were 35 students in IPA class, 40 students in IPS 1, and 38 students IPS 2. Because the number of population was relatively big, more than 100 students, so the writer took 20 % of them. Airasian, (2000: 134) said that descriptive research is common to sample 10 to 20% of the

population. The technique used in this research was proportional sampling. Arikunto, (2006:139) said that in proportional technique, the sample are taken balance that considered based on the number of subject in every group or level. The specification of the population can be seen on the table below:

**TABLE I11.1**  
**THE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND SAMPLE**

NO	CLASS	POPULATION			SAMPLE 20 %
		FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL	
1.	II IPA	22	13	35	7
2.	II IPS 1	19	21	40	8
3.	II IPS 2	21	17	38	8
TOTAL				113	23

#### **E. The Techniques of Collecting Data**

In collecting the data, the writer used test. The test was arranged to measure the capability of the students in summarizing the reading text. It will be constructed by writer based on indicator in operational concept. The writer gave the students three pieces of reading text, and after that asked the students to summarize the text given. The test took about 90 minutes in order the students have more time to comprehend the text.

#### **D. Technique of Analyzing Data**

The data were analyzed descriptively. The study only attempts as objectively as possible to describe and interpret the data of students' ability in summarizing reading text at the second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah.

After collecting the data from respondents, the data analyzed and graded by two Raters. The students' summarizing test was graded by the Scoring Guide of ESL Composition Profile taken from Syafii, (2007:139) as follows:

**TABLE 111.2**  
**THE ESL COMPOSITION PROFILE**

Score	Level	Criteria
Content	30-27	Excellent to very good
	26-22	Good to average
	21-17	Fair to poor
	16-13	Very poor
Organization	20-18	Excellent to very good
	17-14	Good to average
	13-10	Fair to poor
	9-7	Very poor
Vocabulary	20-18	Excellent to very good
	17-14	Good to average
	13-10	Fair to poor
	9-7	Very poor
Language use	20-18	Excellent to very good
	17-14	Good to average
	13-10	Fair to poor
	9-7	Very poor
Mechanics	5	Excellent to very good
	4	Good to average
	3	Fair to poor
	2	Very poor

Comment:

Total score:

Then, to find the level of students' ability in summarizing reading text, the writer used formula as follows (Hartono, 2004:30):

$$M = \frac{\sum Fx}{N}$$

N

Notes:

M = Mean

N = Total number of the students

$\sum Fx$  = Total number of students' score

And the last, to classified their level in summarizing, the writer used category of scoring taken from Harahap, (1979: 158). We can see in the table 3 below:

**TABLE 111.3**

**THE CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS' SCORE**

The score level	Category
80-100	Very good
70-79	Good
60-69	Enough
50-59	Less
0-49	Fail

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **A. The Data Presentation**

Activity in this research focuses on the students' ability in summarizing reading text. The purpose of this research is to obtain the ability of the second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing text.

In order to get the data in this research, the writer used test. The test was used to obtain the ability in summarizing reading text. The sample taken was 23 students. The writer gave reading text to the students and after that asked the students to summarize the text. The writer gave them time 90 minutes because they will spend more time to read and summarize the text.

The writer gave students three pieces of reading text to summarize; two titles were taken from English textbook, and another one was taken from online sources. The writer gave the students three pieces of reading text in different titles to summarize for comparison. So, by giving variety of reading text, the writer can measure their ability more representative.

The students score was analyzed by the readers that have high professionalism in term of writing in order to get the validity and reliability of the test. Jacobs (in Karmina, 2007:22) says that in most administration application of the result of composition test and proficiency and placement testing in particular each test

composition should be read by at least two readers that had been carefully trained for the evaluation. It has purpose to find a reliable evaluation of the students' test.

Dealing with the statement above, in this research the writer used two readers who are considered fully as the score of the students' test. The first reader is M. fauzan Ansyari S.pd. and the second is Jonri Kasdi, S.pd. they are the English lectures of State Islamic University. Therefore, in order to get representative score, the writer used the mean of two readers' score.

#### **1. The data of students' ability in summarizing reading text**

In the following tables, the writer counts and classifies the students' score based on the calculation of the two readers in three pieces of students' summary. The students' score can be shown in the tables below:



**Rater: I**

**TABLE 1V.1**  
**STUDENTS' SCORE IN SUMMARIZING TEST**

**Text 1**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Score Vocabulary</b>	<b>Language Use</b>	<b>Mechanics</b>	<b>Final score</b>
Desi Wulandari	22	15	15	18	3	73
Dinda Hardini	20	14	13	16	3	66
Elsa Manora	18	14	14	15	2	63
Evi Anita	18	14	13	14	2	61
Fitriani	20	15	15	14	3	67
Gensrinawita	18	15	14	14	2	63
Herni	18	14	14	14	2	62
Jusrika	18	13	13	14	2	60
Laila Saridah	18	13	13	13	3	60
Lusi Hariani	20	15	15	16	3	69
Nikmat Saputra	19	16	15	14	3	67
Nova Pertiwi	22	16	15	15	3	71
Ratna Sari	17	13	13	16	2	61
Restya Sari	15	12	12	12	1	52
Rini Islami	19	17	16	15	3	70
Sartika	18	15	15	14	3	65
Sinta	19	17	15	15	3	69
Siti khadijah	18	15	16	14	2	65
Sofyan	19	17	17	15	3	71
Sri Wahyuni	18	15	15	16	2	66
Wahyu dwi	17	14	14	14	2	61
Yualiantika	17	15	15	14	2	63
Zakia	19	16	16	16	3	70

This is the data presentation of second year students' score in summarizing Text 1 analyzed by rater 1. Their summary was graded based on the content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

Based on the table IV.1 above, the writer concludes that most of the students got “fair to poor category” (17-21) in content. It means that, most of the students had limited knowledge about the topic and little substance in development of the topic.

Most of them got “very good to average” (14-17) in organization, it means that in their summary they followed the organization of the original text, they found main ideas but they made incomplete main ideas in their summary. Most of the students got “very good to average” (14-17) in vocabulary, it means that in their summary, they got error word occasionally. Most of the students got “very good to average”(14-17) in language use, because they got minor problems in agreement, tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, and prepositions. And most of them got “fair to poor” (2-4) in mechanics, it means that in their summary, they often got error in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

## Text 2

**TABLE 1V.2**  
**STUDENTS' SCORE IN SUMMARIZING TEST**

Students	Content	Organization	Score Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanics	Final score
Desi Wulandari	18	15	13	19	2	67
Dinda Hardini	20	14	13	16	3	66
Elsa Manora	16	16	14	13	3	62
Evi Anita	15	14	15	14	2	60
Fitriani	20	15	15	15	3	68
Gensrinawita	18	15	14	14	4	65
Herni	17	13	14	17	2	63
Jusrika	17	18	13	14	4	66
Laila Saridah	17	13	15	14	4	63
Lusi Hariani	20	15	15	16	3	69
Nikmat Saputra	18	16	16	15	3	68
Nova Pertiwi	22	17	16	15	2	72
Ratna Sari	17	13	13	12	2	57
Restya Sari	14	12	12	12	1	51
Rini Islami	19	14	16	15	3	67
Sartika	14	15	14	16	3	62
Sinta	19	16	15	15	2	67
Siti khadijah	15	15	16	14	2	62
Sofyan	19	18	18	12	4	71
Sri Wahyuni	16	12	15	16	1	60
Wahyu dwi	16	14	14	13	2	59
Yualiartika	17	15	15	14	1	62
Zakia	19	17	18	15	3	72

Based on the table IV.2 above, the writer concludes that most of the students got “fair to poor category” (17-21) in content. It means that, most of the students had limited knowledge about the topic and little substance in development of the topic.

Most of them got “very good to average” (14-17) in organization, it means that in their summary they followed the organization of the original text, they found main ideas but they made incomplete main ideas in their summary. Most of the students got “very good to average” (14-17) in vocabulary, it means that in their

summary, they got error word occasionally. Most of the students got “very good to average”(14-17) in language use, because they got minor problems in agreement, tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, and prepositions. And most of them got “fair to poor” (2-4) in mechanics, it means that in their summary, they often got error in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

### Text 3

**TABLE 1V.3**  
**STUDENTS' SCORE IN SUMMARIZING TEST**

Students	Content	Organization	Score Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanics	Final score
Desi Wulandari	16	18	18	17	6	75
Dinda Hardini	18	15	13	19	4	69
Elsa Manora	18	14	13	15	3	63
Evi Anita	15	14	12	13	4	58
Fitriani	15	14	15	15	1	60
Gensrinawita	20	15	15	15	2	67
Herni	17	16	14	13	4	64
Jusrika	17	13	15	18	3	66
Laila Saridah	17	18	13	14	4	66
Lusi Hariani	15	12	15	14	2	58
Nikmat Saputra	18	15	16	15	4	68
Nova Pertiwi	18	16	17	16	4	71
Ratna Sari	21	15	17	16	4	73
Restya Sari	15	13	13	12	2	55
Rini Islami	14	12	12	13	1	52
Sartika	20	16	15	15	2	68
Sinta	14	13	15	15	3	60
Siti khadijah	19	16	15	15	2	67
Sofyan	15	12	17	16	5	65
Sri Wahyuni	19	18	18	12	4	71
Wahyu dwi	16	12	13	17	4	62
Yualiartika	18	16	15	13	2	64
Zakia	20	15	15	15	3	68

Based on the table IV.3 above, the writer concludes that most of the students got “fair to poor category” (17-21) in content. It means that, most of the students had limited knowledge about the topic and little substance in development of the topic.

Most of them got “very good to average” (14-17) in organization, it means that in their summary they followed the organization of the original text, they found main ideas but they made incomplete main ideas in their summary. Most of the students got “very good to average” (14-17) in vocabulary, it means that in their

summary, they got error word occasionally. Most of the students got “very good to average”(14-17) in language use, because they got minor problems in agreement, tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, and prepositions. And most of them got “fair to poor” (2-4) in mechanics, it means that in their summary, they often got error in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

**Rater: II**

**TABLE 1V.4**  
**STUDENTS' SCORE IN SUMMARIZING TEST**

**Text 1**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Score Vocabulary</b>	<b>Language Use</b>	<b>Mechanics</b>	<b>Final score</b>
Desi Wulandari	22	15	15	14	7	73
Dinda Hardini	22	16	17	17	6	78
Elsa Manora	21	15	15	15	7	73
Evi Anita	15	9	9	9	2	44
Fitriani	18	12	14	15	7	66
Gensrinawita	17	14	13	13	6	63
Herni	22	17	17	15	7	78
Jusrika	21	16	17	17	5	76
Laila Saridah	17	14	13	10	4	58
Lusi Hariani	22	15	15	15	7	74
Nikmat Saputra	21	16	15	15	5	72
Nova Pertiwi	20	14	16	16	6	72
Ratna Sari	19	13	13	13	4	62
Restya Sari	20	14	14	12	5	65
Rini Islami	17	12	13	12	4	58
Sartika	18	14	15	14	7	68
Sinta	22	17	17	17	4	77
Siti khadijah	20	14	15	14	7	70
Sofyan	21	13	14	13	4	65
Sri Wahyuni	20	15	16	14	7	72
Wahyu dwi	20	12	13	13	4	62
Yualiantika	21	13	13	14	5	66
Zakia	22	13	14	14	6	69

This is the data presentation of second year students' score in summarizing text 1 that were analyzed by rater II. Their summary was graded based on the content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

Based on the table 1V.4 above, the writer concludes that most of the students got "fair to poor" category (17-21) in content, it means that in their summary, most of

the students had limited knowledge about the topic and little substance in development of the topic, “very good to average”(14-17) in organization, it means that in their summary they followed the organization of the original text, they found main ideas but they made incomplete main ideas in their summary. “fair to poor in vocabulary” (10-13) in vocabulary, it means that in their summary, they got error word frequently like idiom form, word choice, the usage of word and the meaning of word was confused or obscured ; ”very good to average”(14-17) in language use because they got minor problems in agreement, tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, and prepositions; and “good to average”(4-7) in mechanics, it means that in their summary the students got occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.



## Text 2

**TABLE 1V.5**  
**STUDENTS' SCORE IN SUMMARIZING TEST**

Students	Content	Organization	Score Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanics	Final score
Desi Wulandari	20	13	15	13	5	66
Dinda Hardini	18	14	14	13	4	63
Elsa Manora	19	15	13	12	4	63
Evi Anita	16	9	9	9	2	45
Fitriani	21	16	17	14	5	73
Gensrinawita	19	15	13	15	4	66
Herni	20	15	14	17	5	71
Jusrika	22	16	17	13	5	73
Laila Saridah	18	12	13	12	7	62
Lusi Hariani	18	15	15	16	6	70
Nikmat Saputra	22	13	13	14	6	68
Nova Pertiwi	20	15	15	14	6	70
Ratna Sari	17	13	13	12	4	59
Restya Sari	20	15	15	14	5	69
Rini Islami	20	14	13	12	5	64
Sartika	18	14	15	14	6	67
Sinta	17	14	14	12	5	63
Siti khadijah	18	13	14	13	5	63
Sofyan	21	14	13	14	6	68
Sri Wahyuni	20	14	15	14	6	69
Wahyu dwi	18	14	12	12	5	61
Yualiantika	22	14	14	14	7	71
Zakia	20	14	15	14	5	68

Based on the table 1V.5 above, the writer concludes that most of the students got “fair to poor” category (17-21) in content, it means that in their summary, most of the students had limited knowledge about the topic and little substance in development of the topic; “very good to average”(14-17) in organization, it means that in their summary they followed the organization of original text , they found

main ideas but they made incomplete main ideas in their summary; “fair to poor in vocabulary” (10-13) in vocabulary, it means that in their summary, they got error word frequently like idiom form, word choice, the usage of word and the meaning of word was confused or obscured ; ”very good to average(14-17) in language use because they got minor problems in agreement, tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, and prepositions; and “very good to average”(4-7) in mechanics, it means that in their summary the students got occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

### Text 3

**TABLE 1V.6**  
**STUDENTS' SCORE IN SUMMARIZING TEST**

Students	Content	Organization	Score Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanics	Final Score
Desi Wulandari	18	14	15	13	6	66
Dinda Hardini	20	13	14	12	4	63
Elsa Manora	22	16	15	14	5	72
Evi Anita	15	9	9	9	2	44
Fitriani	22	16	15	13	6	72
Gensrinawita	18	15	12	14	4	63
Herni	20	16	15	13	4	68
Jusrika	20	17	14	14	5	70
Laila Saridah	17	15	15	14	4	65
Lusi Hariani	18	16	15	15	5	69
Nikmat Saputra	20	15	16	14	5	70
Nova Pertiwi	21	16	15	13	5	70
Ratna Sari	17	13	13	13	6	62
Restya Sari	20	16	15	14	5	70
Rini Islami	18	13	14	13	4	62
Sartika	18	15	16	13	5	67
Sinta	20	15	14	14	4	67
Siti khadijah	17	14	14	14	4	63
Sofyan	22	15	14	14	6	71
Sri Wahyuni	21	15	15	14	5	70
Wahyu dwi	20	13	13	13	4	63
Yualartika	17	14	14	14	5	64
Zakia	18	14	14	14	5	65

Based on the table 1V.6 above, the writer concludes that most of the students got “fair to poor” category (17-21) in content, it means that in their summary, most of the students had limited knowledge about the topic and little substance in development of the topic; “very good to average”(14-17) in organization, it means that in their summary they followed the organization of original text , they found

main ideas but they made incomplete main ideas in their summary; “fair to poor in vocabulary” (10-13) , it means that in their summary, they got error word frequently like idiom form, word choice, the usage of word and the meaning of word was confused or obscured ; ”very good to average(14-17) in language use because they got minor problems in agreement, tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, and prepositions; and “very good to average”(4-7) in mechanics, it means that in their summary the students got occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

**TABLE 1V.7**  
**THE RECAPITULATION OF STUDENTS' SCORE IN SUMMARIZING**  
**TEST**

**Rater 1**

Students	Text 1	Score Text 2	Text 3	Final Score	Category
Desi Wulandari	73	67	75	71.6	Good
Dinda Hardini	66	66	69	67	Enough
Elsa Manora	63	62	63	64.6	Enough
Evi Anita	61	60	58	59.6	Less
Fitriani	67	68	60	65	Enough
Gensrinawita	63	65	67	65	Enough
Herni	62	63	64	63	Enough
Jusrika	60	66	66	64	Enough
Laila Saridah	60	63	66	63	Enough
Lusi Hariani	69	69	58	65.3	Enough
Nikmat Saputra	67	68	68	67.6	Enough
Nova Pertiwi	71	72	71	71.3	Good
Ratna Sari	61	57	73	63.6	Enough
Restya Sari	52	51	55	52.6	Less
Rini Islami	70	67	52	63	Enough
Sartika	65	62	68	65	Enough
Sinta	69	67	60	65.3	Enough
Siti khadijah	65	62	67	64.6	Enough
Sofyan	71	71	65	69	Enough
Sri Wahyuni	66	60	71	65.6	Enough
Wahyu dwi	61	59	62	60.6	Enough
Yualartika	63	62	64	63	Enough
Zakia	70	72	68	70	Good

From table 1V.7 above, we can see the final score of students in summarizing analyzed by rater 1. Most of the students got enough categories.

**TABLE 1V.8**  
**THE RECAPITULATION OF STUDENTS' SCORE IN SUMMARIZING**  
**TEST**

**Rater 11**

Students	Text 1	Score Text 2	Text 3	Final Score	Category
Desi Wulandari	73	66	66	68.3	Enough
Dinda Hardini	78	63	63	68	Enough
Elsa Manora	73	63	72	69.3	Enough
Evi Anita	44	45	44	44.3	Fail
Fitriani	66	73	72	70.3	Good
Gensrinawita	63	66	63	64	Enough
Herni	78	71	68	72.3	Good
Jusrika	76	73	70	73	Good
Laila Saridah	58	62	65	61.6	Enough
Lusi Hariani	74	70	69	71	Good
Nikmat Saputra	72	68	70	70	Good
Nova Pertiwi	72	70	70	70.6	Good
Ratna Sari	62	59	62	61	Enough
Restya Sari	65	69	70	68	Enough
Rini Islami	58	64	62	61.3	Enough
Sartika	68	67	67	67.3	Enough
Sinta	77	63	67	69	Enough
Siti khadijah	70	63	63	65.3	Enough
Sofyan	65	68	71	68	Enough
Sri Wahyuni	72	69	70	70	Good
Wahyu dwi	62	61	63	62	Enough
Yualartika	66	71	64	77	Good
Zakia	69	68	65	67.3	Enough

Based on the table 1V.8 above, we can see the final score of the students in summarizing analyzed by rater 2. Most of the students got enough categories.

**TABLE 1V.9**  
**THE RECAPITULATION OF STUDENTS' ABILITY IN SUMMARIZING**  
**READING TEXT**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Score</b>		<b>Final Score</b>	<b>Category</b>
	<b>Rater 1</b>	<b>Rater 2</b>		
Desi Wulandari	71.6	68.3	69.95	Good
Dinda Hardini	67	68	67.5	Enough
Elsa Manora	64.6	69.3	66.95	Good
Evi Anita	59.6	44.3	51.95	Less
Fitriani	65	70.3	67.65	Good
Gensrinawita	65	64	64.5	Enough
Herni	63	72.3	67.65	Good
Jusrika	64	73	68.5	Good
Laila Saridah	63	61.6	62.3	Enough
Lusi Hariani	65.3	71	68.15	Good
Nikmat Saputra	67.6	70	68.8	Good
Nova Pertiwi	71.3	70.6	70.95	Good
Ratna Sari	63.6	61	62.3	Enough
Restya Sari	52.6	68	60.3	Enough
Rini Islami	63	61.3	62.15	Enough
Sartika	65	67.3	66.15	Enough
Sinta	65.3	69	67.15	Good
Siti khadijah	64.6	65.3	64.95	Enough
Sofyan	69	68	68.5	Enough
Sri Wahyuni	65.6	70	67.8	Enough
Wahyu dwi	60.6	62	61.3	Enough
Yualiartika	63	77	70	Enough
Zakia	70	67.3	68.65	Good

After getting the data of students score in summarizing by the two raters, then the writer accounts the final score of students in summarizing as Karmina (2007: 26) calculate the final score of students' translating test based on the calculation of the two different scores by two raters. Based on the table 1V.9 above, it can see the final score of the students in summarizing reading text.

## **B. The Data Analysis**

### **1. The Data Analysis of Students' Ability of in Summarizing Reading Text.**

The first step in getting quantitative analysis result is by collecting and scoring the data. Then, the next step is counting the percentage of the level of second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing Reading text.

To know the percentage of students' ability in summarizing, the writer calculated it by accounting means score of the students' score in summarizing tes.

To obtain the mean score of the ability of second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing Reading text, the writer used formula as follows ( Hartono, 2004:30)

$$M = \frac{\sum Fx}{N}$$

Notes:

M = Mean

N = Total number of the students

Fx = Total number of score

Based on the rating scale, the writer grades the ability of second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing reading text in to very good, good, enough, less, and fails.



**TABLE 1V.10**  
**THE AVERAGE SCORE OF STUDENTS' ABILITY IN SUMMARIZING**  
**READING TEXT**

Score(x)	F	Fx
70.95	1	70.95
70	1	70
69.95	1	69.95
68.8	1	68.8
68.65	1	68.65
68.5	2	137
68.15	1	68.15
67.8	1	67.8
67.65	2	135.3
67.5	1	67.5
67.15	1	67.15
66.95	1	66.95
66.15	1	66.15
64.95	1	64.95
64.5	1	64.5
62.3	2	124.6
62.15	1	62.15
61.3	1	61.3
60.3	1	60.3
51.95	1	51.95
Total	N = 23	$\sum Fx = 1514.1$

The percentage of students' ability of second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing reading text as follows:

$$M = \frac{\sum Fx}{N}$$

$$= \frac{1514.1}{23} = 65.83$$

**TABLE.1V.11**

### THE CLASSIFICATION ABILITY IN SUMMARIZING READING TEXT

No	Classification		Frequency	Percentage
	Ability level	Rank		
1	Very good	80-100	0	0%
2	Good	70-79	2	9%
3	Enough	60-69	20	87%
4	Less	50-59	1	4%
5	Fail	0-49	0	0%
	Total		23	100%

The table shows that the frequency of score ranges of respondents in summarizing reading text. 0% of respondents is classified in to Very good, 9 % of respondents are classified in to Good, 87% of respondents are classified in to enough, 4% of respondents are classified in to less, and no respondents is classified in to Fail. The average score of the students' ability in summarizing reading text is 65.38. It means that the students' ability in summarizing reading text is classified in to enough (60-69).

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

In this chapter, the writer presents conclusion of those which have been discussed in the previously chapter, and then give recommendation concerning with the student's ability in summarizing reading text.

#### **A. CONCLUSION**

Based on the explanation in the chapter 1V, the writer concludes that the ability of second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing is classified in to enough level because proportion level of students is 65.38 which is located at the category 60- 69%.

#### **B. SUGGESTION**

Because the ability of second year students of SMA Muhammadiyah Rambah in summarizing is classified in to enough (between Rank of 60-69), so, the writer gives some recommendation for the students and teacher as follows:

##### **1. For the students**

The students should improve and increase their ability in summarizing reading text. The students can increase their ability in summarizing by following the process of summarizing reading text taken from Reid (1988:110-111):

- 1) The students should read the text quickly, looking for main ideas.
- 2) The students should read the text again carefully, absorbing the information.

- 3) The students should condense main ideas that will need to use in summarizing.
- 4) The students should arrange main ideas carefully and write down their summary by own words.

2. For the teacher

Because the ability in summarizing influence the students' ability in reading comprehension, so the teacher should motivate the students in summarizing by choosing the interesting text to summarize, not only from students' textbook but also from other resources. And then, the teacher should explain the students the way to summarize reading text well.

## REFERENCES

- Airasian, P. and Gay.L.R.2000. *Educational Research*. United States of America: Prentice Hall.
- Anas, Sujdono 1987. *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*. Jakarta. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Brown and Palinscar . 1984. *Reading Strategies*. 2000. May, 04<sup>th</sup> ,2009. on [http://en.wikipedia.org/part\\_of\\_a\\_series\\_/reading\\_](http://en.wikipedia.org/part_of_a_series_/reading_).
- Clark .Herbert.H and Clark .Eve.V 1977. *Psychology and Language*. United States of America: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, INC.
- Eko Andayani. 2007. A Study on the Ability of Reading Visual Information by The Second Year Students of English Education Department of Uin Suska : Unpublished Paper.
- Hartono. 2004. *Statistik untuk Penelitian*. Pekanbaru : Pustaka Pelajar.
- Hornby, Parnwell, and Siswojo .1984. *Kamus Inggris –Indonesia*. Jakarta : Pustaka Ilmu.
- Kalayo Hasibuan, Muhammad Fauzan Ansyari.2007. Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press.
- Karmina. 2007. Students' Ability in Translation Based on Their Mastery of Using Context Clues in Translating the Text of English to Indonesian At the Third Years of English Education Departement of UIN Suska Riau: Unpublished Paper.
- Longman. 1999. *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. England : British Library.
- McWhorter. Kathleen T.1986. *Guide to College Reading*. United States of America: Little Brown and Company.
- Mc Whorter.1992. *Efficient and Flexible Reading*. United States of America: Harper Collins Publisher.

- M.Syafii .S. 2007. *from Paragraphs to a Research Report : A Writing of English for Academic Purpose*. Pekanbaru : LBSI.
- M. Syafii, M. fauzan Ansyari, and Jonri Kasdi.2007. *The Effective Paragraph developments: The process of writing for Classroom Setting*. Pekanbaru : LBSI.
- Nasrun Harahap. 1979. *Teknik Penilaian Hasil Belajar*. Jakarta :Bulan Bintang.
- Nuttal, Christine.1983. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Langguage*. London : Heinemann Educational Books.
- Reid. Joy. M. 1988. *The Process of Composition*. United States of America: Prentice Hall Regents Englewood Cliffs N. J.
- Reid. Joy. M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. United States of America: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Richards. C, John Platt,and Heidi Platt.1999. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. England: British Library.
- Suharsimi Arikunto. 2003. *Prosedur Penenlitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta : PT. Rineka Cipta.
- U.S. National Reading Panel. 2009. *Teaching Reading Comprehension*. May, 04<sup>th</sup>, 2009 on [http://en.wikipedia.org/part\\_of a series /reading](http://en.wikipedia.org/part_of_a_series/reading).
- Vivi Kamalasari. 2005. Improving Students' Ability in Reading Comprehension Through Small Groups Work at MAN 2 PEKANBARU : Unpublished Paper.
- Wikipedia. 2009. *The free dictionary*. May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2009 : 02 o'clock. On <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ability>.

## LIST OF TABLE

Table 3.1 Sample of the research .....	19
Table 3.2 Scoring guide .....	20
Table 3.3 Classification of students' score .....	21
Table 4.1 Students score on summarizing text 1 by rater 1 .....	24
Table 4.2 Students score on summarizing text 2.....	26
Table 4.3 Students score on summarizing text 3 .....	28
Table 4.4 Students score on summarizing text 1 by rater 2 .....	30
Table 4.5 Students score on summarizing text 2.....	32
Table 4.6 Students score on summarizing text 3.....	34
Table 4.7 Recapitulation of students score on summarizing test by rater 1.....	36
Table 4.8 Recapitulation of students score on summarizing test by rater 2.....	37
Table 4.9 Recapitulation of students score on summarizing test by rater 1 and 2	38
Table 4.10 Average score of students' ability in summarizing.....	40
Table 4.11 Classification ability in summarizing.....	41